

APPENDIX A

State	Relevant State Statute	Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs Have No Standing to Sue Under State Law
Alabama	Ala. Code §§ 8-10-1, <i>et seq.</i>	Alabama’s antitrust statutes do not reach interstate commerce. <i>See Abbott Laboratories v. Durrett</i> , 746 So. 2d 316, *337-39 (Sup. Ct. Ala. 1999) (holding that “these statutes regulate monopolistic activities that occur within . . . the geographic boundaries of the state” because “the Legislature intended to limit the scope of Alabama’s antitrust regulations to transactions involving intrastate commerce.”)
Alaska	Alaska Stat. §§ 45.50.562, <i>et seq.</i>	Only the Alaska Attorney General may seek monetary relief on behalf of indirect purchasers. <i>In re Lidoderm Antitrust Litig.</i> , 103 F. Supp. 3d 1155, 1163 (N.D. Cal. 2015).
Arkansas	Ark. Code Ann. §§ 4-75-301, <i>et seq.</i>	“There is no private right to a cause of action pursuant to the subchapter of the Arkansas Code relating to unfair monopolies.” <i>Coffee.org, Inc. v. Green Mountain Coffee Roasters, Inc.</i> , 2012 WL 511485, at *4 (W.D. Ark. Feb 15, 2012).
Colorado	Colo. Rev. Stat. §§ 6-4-104, <i>et seq.</i>	Indirect purchaser actions are not allowed under Colorado law. <i>Pomerantz v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 50 P.3d 929, 934 (Colo. App. 2002)
Connecticut	Conn. Gen. Stat. §§ 42-110b, <i>et seq.</i>	Plaintiffs do not have standing to bring suit under the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act because it requires privity between the plaintiff and defendant in private suits. <i>Vacco v. Microsoft Corp.</i> , 260 Conn. 59, 87 (2002).
Idaho	Idaho Code §§ 48-104, <i>et seq.</i>	Idaho law only allows an attorney general to bring an action on behalf of an indirect purchaser. Idaho Code § 48-108.
Illinois	740 Ill. Comp. Stat. §§ 10/3, <i>et seq.</i>	Indirect purchaser class suits may only be brought by the Illinois Attorney General as <i>parens patriae</i> . 740 Ill. Comp. Stat. § 10/7; <i>Staley v. Gilead Sciences, Inc.</i> , 446 F. Supp. 3d 578, 626 (N.D. Cal. 2020) (dismissing indirect purchaser claim made under Illinois Antitrust Act); <i>In re Nexium (Esomeprazole) Antitrust Litig.</i> , 968 F. Supp. 2d 367, 409 (D. Mass. 2013) (same).

State	Relevant State Statute	Indirect Purchaser Plaintiffs Have No Standing to Sue Under State Law
Maryland	Md. Code, Com Law, Section 11-204, <i>et seq.</i>	Only the state or a political subdivision thereof may maintain an action for damages stemming from an antitrust violation in Maryland. Md. Code Ann., Com. Law § 11-209(b)(ii).
Washington	Was. Rev. Code Ann. §§ 19.86.010 <i>et seq.</i>	Indirect purchaser actions are not allowed under Washington law. <i>Blewett v. Abbott Laboratories</i> , 86 Wash. App. 782, 783-84 (Wash. Ct. App. 1997) (“Guided by <i>Illinois Brick</i> , we hold indirect purchasers are not “injured” by anti-competitive activity and therefore lack standing to sue under RCW 19.86.090.”)